Application No. pplicant(s) DELGORGUE ET AL. 10/023,987 Interview Summary Art Unit Examiner 3728 Marie Patterson All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Marie Patterson. (2) James Rowland. Date of Interview: 14 January 2003. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c)⊠ Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: A boot as disclosed was shown. Claim(s) discussed: All of record. Identification of prior art discussed: Applied references. Agreement with respect to the claims f) \square was reached. g) \boxtimes was not reached. h) \square N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed to argue the definition/intended meaning of flap, the Examiner suggests adding limitations to limit the meaning of the term flap in claims such as claim3. The Examiner would consider such an amendment at this time. The other arguments and suggested amendments would appear to raise new issues. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE PORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 7/3:04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Immary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

LIOH.

Examiner's signature, if required